REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 21, 2009. Claims 1–13 are currently pending. The claims have been amended to more clearly and distinctly recite the subject matter that applicants regard as their invention. Claim 10 has been amended to correct an informality. Reconsideration of the claim rejections is requested in view of the following remarks.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 10–12. The Examiner has objected to claim 10 for containing an informality. Claim 10 has been amended to correct this informality. It is believed that this amendment obviates the Examiner's objection.

Claims 1, 4–6, 8, 9, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0123142 to Freeman (hereinafter "Freeman").

Preliminarily, it should be noted that Freeman represents an attempt to solve a fundamentally different problem from that of the present invention. The present invention is directed to preventing the unauthorized transfer of information from one device to another. It addresses the problem by providing for a transfer using an access card that is paired with the destination device. The claims have been amended to more clearly recite this feature. Support for this feature is provided, for example, on page 6, lines 12-29, which describes the process by which a public key of the destination device is written to a write once memory to create the unique one-to-one correspondence between the access card and the destination device. Nowhere does Freeman disclose or suggest such a feature. Indeed, Freeman is directed to an entirely different problem and thus, it is not surprising that Freeman fails to disclose or suggest this feature.

Freeman, on the other hand, is directed to a technique for securely changing encryption keys. Although both use encryption, Freeman's technique has little applicability to the conditional access systems described in the present specification. Because Freeman is a solution to a different problem than that posed by the present invention, it teaches a substantially different technique. This is evident from the fact that it lacks several elements recited in the present claims.

In addition to the pairing feature, all of independent claims 1, 6, 8, 9, and 13 recite storage and use of **conditional access data** and/or **conditional access certificates**. The Examiner asserts that Freeman discloses these elements variously in its discussion of prior art key-change techniques (¶30), its discussion of preventing replay attacks (¶31), its discussion of its key-change procedure (¶60), and a discussion cited on pages 11 and 12 of the Office Action which does not appear to refer to any of the currently cited art.

However, Freeman simply makes no reference to conditional access data or conditional access certificates. Those having ordinary skill in the art will recognize that a conditional access system is designed to protect data that is provided to consumers. An example of a common conditional access system is the encryption used to prevent theft of cable TV services. The present invention discloses conditional access certificates which allow a user to access digitally protected data which the user has purchased. Such a system not only protects against copying by third parties, but also prevents unauthorized copying by the intended recipient of the data. The present invention puts forth ways for a user to easily obtain such authorization.

The Examiner does not point to anything in Freeman which could be reasonably identified as conditional access data or certificates. Indeed, Freeman is solely concerned with public/private key cryptography and has no need for the additional layer of content protection which a conditional access system provides.

It is therefore respectfully asserted that Freeman fails to disclose or suggest conditional access data and conditional access certificates.

Claims 2, 3, and 7 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Freeman in view of U.S. Patent No. 2003/0046544 to Roskind et al. (hereinafter "Roskind").

Claims 2, 3, and 7 depend from claims 1 and 6 and include all of the elements of their parent claims. Roskind is directed to a digital certificate with a limited useful life. Roskind does not disclose systems and methods for encryption and decryption of media content, as claimed in the claims of the present invention. Roskind only teaches systems and methods for authentication of certificates. As such Roskind does not remotely suggest any of the above deficiencies of Freeman with respect to claims 1 and 6 that are described above. It is therefore respectfully asserted that Freeman and/or Roskind, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 4, 5, and 7. It is believed that claims 4, 5, and 7 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections set forth in the Office Action be withdrawn, and that the pending claims be allowed for at least the stated reasons.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to applicant's Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

John Alan Gervais et al.

By: _____

Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 40,677
(609) 734-6815

THOMSON LICENSING, INC.
Patent Operations
P.O. Box 5312
2 Independence Way
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

October 9, 2009